

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/765,606	NOJIRI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Lauren Q Wells	1617

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Sreeni Padmanabhan.

(3) Kirsten Grineberg

(2) Lauren Wells.

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 October 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative],

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: art of record.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: see below.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

- ① Applicant will consider providing a comparative data between a composition comprising Arginine (3%) + Patchouli oil (5%) against a composition comprising Arginine (3%) alone and Patchouli oil (5%) alone.
- ② Applicant will consider either deleting or amending claim 12.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required